

REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the specification for failing to include referenced U.S. Patent Application numbers; requested that the steps of the independent claims be identified in the drawings; rejected claims 1-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the application regards as the invention; and rejected claims 1-46 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over GRABER et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,812,769).

By way of this amendment, portions of the specification as well as claims 1-8, 10-17, 19-20, 22-27, 31-32, 34, 36-42, 44, and 46 have been amended to improve form. Claim 9 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Accordingly, claims 1-8 and 10-46 are pending in the present application. Reconsideration and allowance of all claims in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Initially, the Examiner objected to page 1 of the Specification for failing to include related U.S. Patent Application numbers. Accordingly, Applicants have amended the specification as set forth above to correct the noted deficiencies. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the objections are therefore respectfully requested.

The Examiner next requested that Applicants identify each of the steps of the independent claims in the drawings in accordance with Rule 1.83a and 1.75d(1). Applicants believe that the application and associated drawings to speak for clearly teach the elements of the independent claims without further explanation. Nonetheless, the Examiner is directed to Figs. 5A-5D, 10, 11, and 12A-12B as illustrating exemplary embodiments of features recited in the present independent claims. Absent a more

specific indication of an alleged deficiency in the drawings, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the pending objection.

Claims 1-23 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. More specifically, the Examiner indicates the scope of claims 1, 4, and 5 is not clear (Office Action, pg. 2). Additionally, although not specifically rejected, the Examiner indicates that claims 24-27, 31, 38, 39, 41, and 46 include similar defects as claim 1 (Office Action, pg. 2). Accordingly, Applicants have amended claims 1-8, 10-17, 19-20, 22-27, 31-32, 34, 36-42, 44 and 46 to improve the form of the claims and to further clarify the scope of the invention. In view of these amendments, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-46 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over GRABER et al. Applicants respectfully traverse.

Independent claim 1, as amended, recites a method for processing a request at a first server to form a modified request that is directed to a second server, the first and second servers being coupled to a network. The method includes receiving the request from a requestor, the request including at least a port number. An initial hostname portion of the request associated with a network address of the first server is identified. A replacement hostname portion for the request is retrieved from storage associated with the server based on at least the port number, where the replacement hostname portion is associated with a network address of the second server. The initial hostname portion is replaced with the replacement hostname portion to form the modified request. The modified request is forwarded to the second server using the replacement hostname

portion. Information associated with the modified request is received from the second server. The received information is modified to associate the received information with the first server.

Applicants submit that GRABER et al. fails to disclose or suggest the combination of features recited in Applicants' claim 1, as amended, as required by 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

For example, GRABER et al. does not disclose or suggest the request including at least a port number and retrieving the replacement hostname portion from storage associated with the server based on at least the port number. The Examiner relied upon col. 3, line 28 for allegedly disclosing using a port number to retrieve the replacement hostname portion (Office Action, pg. 4). Applicants respectfully submit that this section of GRABER et al. does not disclose or suggest the features of claim 1 recited above.

At col. 3, line 27-31, GRABER et al. discloses:

A destination URL is formed with redirecting means by substituting the destination URL portion in place of the second portion in the current URL, wherein the destination URL represents a relative address of the second location on the WWW.

This section of GRABER et al. discloses forming a destination URL directly from information included in a signal transmitted to a redirecting means. This section of GRABER et al. does not disclose or reasonably suggest retrieving a replacement hostname portion from storage associated with the first server based upon a port number included in the request. In fact, the current URL of GRABER et al. does not even include a port number. Additionally, it is clear that the destination URL of GRABER et al. is formed by the redirecting means based upon a second portion of the received "signal" and not retrieved from storage associated with the first server.

For at least the foregoing reason, Applicants submit that claim 1 is patentable over GRABER et al.

Claims 2-8 and 10-23 depend from claim 1. Therefore, Applicants submit that these claims are patentable over GRABER et al. for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 1. Moreover, these claims recite additional features not disclosed or suggested by GRABER et al.

For example, claim 15 recites retrieving the replacement hostname portion from storage associated with the first server based on at least the port number and the initial hostname portion. Additionally, claim 16 recites retrieving the replacement hostname portion from storage based on at least the port number and a requestor or session identifier. Also, claim 17 recites retrieving the replacement hostname portion from storage based on a host variable provided with the request. Applicants submit that since GRABER et al. does not disclose retrieving the replacement hostname portion from storage, GRABER et al. cannot disclose the features of claims 15-17. The Examiner does not specifically address the features of claims 15-17 in the Office Action and does not indicate a portion of GRABER et al. allegedly disclosing the claimed features. Accordingly, a prima facie case of obviousness has not been established with respect to claims 15-17. For at least these additional reasons, Applicants submit that claims 15-17 are patentable over GRABER et al.

Claims 18-20 depend from claim 17. Therefore, Applicants submit that these claims are patentable over GRABER et al. for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 17.

Regarding independent claims 24, 26, 27, 31, 38, 39, and 49, the Examiner indicates at page 4 of the Office Action that these claims are rejected under GRABER et al. for the same reasons as claims 1-23. Applicants respectfully disagree.

For example, claim 24, as amended, recites a method for modifying a markup language document to facilitate access to other resources residing on remote servers through an intermediate server. The method includes receiving, at the intermediate server, the markup language document including at least one original link to another resource. The at least one original link of the markup language document is modified to link to the intermediary server, to form a modified markup language document having at least one modified link, where the modified link is associated with the resource and the intermediary server. The modified markup language document is forwarded to a requestor. A request for a markup language document associated with the at least one modified link is received from the requestor. A second markup language document associated with the original link is retrieved from the resource. The second markup language document is forwarded to the requestor.

No indication is provided where any of the claim elements recited in claim 24 may be found in the cited GRABER et al. reference. More specifically, the Examiner fails to indicate where GRABER et al. discloses or suggests modifying an original link in a markup language document to link to the intermediary server. Therefore, a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. §103 has not been made. For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that claim 24 is patentable over GRABER et al.

Claims 25 depends from claim 24. Accordingly, claim 25 is patentable over GRABER et al. for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 24,

PATENT
U.S. Patent Application No. 09/706,182
Attorney Docket No. **0023-0217**

Independent claims 26, 27, 31, 38, 39, and 46 recite features similar to features recited above with respect to claim 24. Therefore, Applicants submit that claims 26, 27, 31, 38, 39, and 46 are patentable over GRABER et al for reasons similar to reasons given above with respect to claim 24.

Claim 28-30 depend from claim 27. Therefore, these claims are patentable over GRABER et al. for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 27. Claims 32-37 depend from claim 31. Therefore, these claims are patentable over GRABER et al. for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 31. Claims 40-45 depend from claim 39. Therefore, these claims are patentable over GRABER et al. for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 39.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner's reconsideration of this application, and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

PATENT
U.S. Patent Application No. 09/706,182
Attorney Docket No. 0023-0217

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 50-1070 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

HARRITY & SNYDER, L.L.P.

By:

Robin C. Clark
Registration No. 40,956

Date: August 18, 2004

11240 Waples Mill Road
Suite 300
Fairfax, Virginia 22030
Customer Number: 44987
(571) 432-0800